



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/676,924	10/02/2000	Shy Cohen	13768.604.7	3782

7590 10/18/2007
RICK D. NYDEGGER
WORKMAN NYDEGGER
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HAI V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/18/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/676,924	Applicant(s) COHEN, SHY	
	Examiner Hai V. Nguyen	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-13, 15-20, 22 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-13, 15-20, 22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the communication received on 05 July 2007.
2. Claims 3, 5, 7, 14, 21 were cancelled.
3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-13, 15-20, 22 and 23 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, see Applicant's remarks, pages 10-11 filed on 05 July 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 13, 20 under 35 USC 103(a) and to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Masters US patent # 6,374,300, Becker et al. US patent # 6,557,038 B1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-13, 15-20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Masters** US patent # **6,374,300** and in view of **Becker** et al. US patent # **6,557,038 B1**.

7. As to claim 1, Masters discloses the method comprising:

transmitting a first HTTP-based "request" from the first processor (*Fig. 8, client 272*) to the second processor (*Fig. 1, server 274*) for establishing a first communication

Art Unit: 2142

channel between the first processor and the second processor through the proxy server (*Fig. 1, proxy 270*) to allow the transfer of first messages from the first processor to the second processor, and the delivery of first message delivery acknowledgments from the second processor to the first processor (*Fig. 8, col. 13, line 50 - col. 14, line 44*);

transmitting a first parked HTTP-based "request" from the first processor to be parked at the second processor for establishing a persistent communication channel between the first processor and the second processor through the proxy server to allow the transfer of second messages from the second processor to the first processor, and the delivery of second message delivery acknowledges from the first processor to the second processor (*Master, Fig. 8, col. 13, line 50 - col. 14, line 44*);

receiving a first HTTP-based "reply" from the second processor to the first processor in response to the first parked HTTP-based "request" (*Masters, Fig. 8, col. 13, line 50 - col. 14, line 44*); and

However, Masters does not explicitly disclose wherein the first HTTP-based "request" includes therein a request that the second processor transmits a reply after the expiration of the a time period even if there are no messages to send to the first processor so that the first processor can assess a status of the connection thereto; in response to receiving the first HTTP-based "reply", transmitting a second parked HTTP-based "request" via the proxy server to the second processor, the second parked HTTP-based "request" including an acknowledgment to the first HTTP-based "reply" in order to maintain the persistent HTTP connection between the first processor and the second processor through the proxy server, and wherein the second parked HTTP-

Art Unit: 2142

based "request" includes therein a request that the second processor transmits a reply after the expiration of the a time period even if there are no messages to send to the first processor in order to ensure persistent connectivity between the first and second processor.

Becker discloses in figure 8 that *"the http header 800 illustrates the header returned to the client in response to receipt of an indication. The HTTP header code that the server returns to the client browser from a `ping` is 204 No Content, which is located within status line 802 in header 800. This indicates that the server has fulfilled the request but there is no new information to send back"* (Fig. 8, col. 7, lines 38-50).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated Becker's teachings of the indication sent to the source with the teachings of Master, for the purpose of *preventing a termination of the session at the source* (Becker, Abstract).

8. As to claim 2, Masters-Becker discloses wherein the first HTTP-based "request" includes at least one of the first messages therein (Becker, Figs. 7-12, col. 7, line 24 – col. 8, line 43).

9. As to claim 4, Masters-Becker discloses wherein the first HTTP-based "replies" includes at least one of the second messages therein (Becker, Figs. 7-12, col. 7, line 24 – col. 8, line 43).

10. As to claim 6, Masters-Becker discloses wherein the first processor only receives the first HTTP-based "reply" from the second processor on the persistent communication channel when the second processor has at least one of the second

Art Unit: 2142

messages to send to the first processor (*Becker, Figs. 7-12, col. 7, line 24 – col. 8, line 43*).

11. As to claim 8, Masters-Becker discloses setting the time period to be less than two days (*Becker, the time period can be resettable or selectable by user process or server process*) (*Becker, Figs. 7-12, col. 7, line 24 – col. 8, line 43*).

12. As to claim 9, Masters-Becker discloses setting the time period to be approximately five minutes (*Becker, the time period can be resettable or selectable by user process or server process*) (*Becker, Figs. 7-12, col. 7, line 24 – col. 8, line 43*).

13. As to claim 10, Masters-Becker discloses comprising dynamically adjusting the time period based upon a connection time out closure controlled by the proxy server (*Becker, Figs. 7-12, col. 7, line 24 – col. 8, line 43*).

14. As to claim 11, Masters-Becker discloses wherein the dynamically adjusting of the time period comprises: receiving a connection time out closure message from the proxy server; determining a first time between transmitting the second HTTP-based "request" and receiving a connection time out closure message from the proxy server; and calculating a new time period to be less than the first time and less than the time period (*Becker, Figs. 7-12, col. 7, line 24 – col. 8, line 43*).

15. Claim 12 corresponds to the computer readable medium claim of claim 1; therefore it rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

16. As to claim 13, Masters discloses the method of enabling transmission of unsolicited messages from a server to a client by ensuring that a persistent connection between the server and the client does not timeout, wherein the client resides on a

Art Unit: 2142

private computer network having a proxy server between the private computer and a public computer network, and wherein the server transmits the unsolicited messages over the public computer network (*Fig. 8, col. 13, line 50 - col. 14, line 44*)

However, Master does not explicitly disclose selecting by a client a connection time out period used in order to determine a time duration in which the client is to receive a "reply" message from a server in order to ensure persistent connectivity between the client and the server; allowing the client to include the connection time out period in a parked HTTP-based "request" sent from the client to be parked at the server for requesting a HTTP-based "reply" from the server after expiration of the connection time out period even if there are no messages to send to the client in order to avoid connection termination by the proxy server due to communication inactivity; and transmitting the parked HTTP-based "request" to the server via the proxy server to open a persistent connection therewith.

Becker discloses in figure 8 that *"the http header 800 illustrates the header returned to the client in response to receipt of an indication. The HTTP header code that the server returns to the client browser from a 'ping' is 204 No Content, which is located within status line 802 in header 800. This indicates that the server has fulfilled the request but there is no new information to send back"* (*Fig. 8, col. 7, lines 38-50*).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated Becker's teachings of the indication sent to the source with the teachings of Master, for the purpose of *preventing a termination of the session at the source* (*Becker, Abstract*).

Art Unit: 2142

17. As to claim 15, Masters-Becker discloses dynamically adjusting the time period based upon a connection time out closure controlled by the proxy server due to the communication inactivity (*Becker, Figs. 7-12, col. 7, line 24 – col. 8, line 43*).

18. As to claim 16, Masters-Becker discloses receiving a connection time out closure message from the proxy server; upon receiving the time out closure message from the proxy, calculating a new time period from the transmitting of the HTTP-based request to the receiving of the connection time out closure message; reducing the connection time out period to be less than the new time period and less than a current value of the connection time out period in order to create a new connection time out period; including the new connection time out period in a second parked HTTP-based “request” requesting a HTTP-based “reply” from the server after the expiration of the new connection time out period even if there are no messages to send to the client in order to avoid connection termination by the proxy due to communication inactivity; and transmitting the second parked HTTP-based “request” to the server via the proxy server to maintain the persistent connection therewith (*Becker, Figs. 7-12, col. 7, line 24 – col. 8, line 43*).

19. As to claim 17, Masters-Becker discloses receiving a connection time out closure message from the proxy server indicating that the proxy server has closed the persistent connection; calculating a new time period from the transmitting of the HTTP-based request to the receiving of the connection time out closure message; and transmitting an HTTP-based request to the server via the proxy server to open a persistent connection therewith, the HTTP-based request requesting a reply from the

Art Unit: 2142

server when the server has messages to send to the client and after the expiration of the connection time out period if there are no messages to send to the client (*Becker, Figs. 7-12, col. 7, line 24 – col. 8, line 43*).

20. As to claim 18, Masters-Becker discloses receiving a connection time out closure message from the proxy server; reducing the connection time out period to form a new connection time out period shorter in duration than the connection time out period; and transmitting a third parked HTTP-based “request” to the server via the proxy server to open a persistent connection therewith, the third parked HTTP-based “request” requesting a reply from the server when the server has messages to send to the client and after the expiration of the new connection time out period if there are no messages to send to the client (*Becker, Figs. 7-12, col. 7, line 24 – col. 8, line 43*).

21. Claim 19 corresponds to the computer readable medium claim of claim 13; therefore it rejected under the same rationale as claim 13.

22. As to claim 20, Masters discloses a method of transmitting unsolicited messages via a public computer network to a client residing on a private computer network, the private computer network including a proxy server, the method comprising: receiving an HTTP-based “request” originating from the client through the proxy server, wherein the HTTP-based “request” includes a first connection time out period used in order to determine a time duration in which the client is to receive a “reply” message in order to ensure persistent connectivity between the client and a server (*Masters, Fig. 8, col. 13, line 50 - col. 14, line 44*); and

However, Masters does not explicitly disclose parking the HTTP-based "request" without responding thereto unless the first connection time out period expires, the parking of the HTTP-based "request" establishing a persistent connection from the client through the proxy server; and when the first connection time out period expires, generating an HTTP-based reply to the HTTP-based request parked for the client, the HTTP-based "reply" containing the message therein; transmitting the HTTP-based "reply"; receiving a second HTTP-based request including a message acknowledgement from the client through the proxy server acknowledging the receipt of the HTTP-based "reply" and also including a second connection time out period; and parking the second HTTP-based request without responding thereto unless the second connection time out period expires, the parking the second HTTP-based request maintaining the persistent connection from the client through the proxy server.

Becker discloses in figure 8 that *"the http header 800 illustrates the header returned to the client in response to receipt of an indication. The HTTP header code that the server returns to the client browser from a 'ping' is 204 No Content, which is located within status line 802 in header 800. This indicates that the server has fulfilled the request but there is no new information to send back"* (Fig. 8, col. 7, lines 38-50).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated Becker's teachings of the indication sent to the source with the teachings of Master, for the purpose of *preventing a termination of the session at the source* (Becker, Abstract).

Art Unit: 2142

23. As to claim 22, Masters-Becker discloses wherein the second connection time out period is different than the first connection time out period (*Becker, Figs. 7-12, col. 7, line 24 – col. 8, line 43*).

24. Claim 23 corresponds to the computer readable medium claim of claim 20; therefore it rejected under the same rationale as claim 20.

25. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this action.

Art Unit: 2142

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai V. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3901. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00-3:30 Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hai V. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2142

HN



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER